



APPLICANT'S REPLY
TO SECOND OFFICE ACTION

Election/Restriction

- "1. Page 2, Line 6: "Applicant further confirms that the product as claimed can be used in glasses..."**

Applicant has made no reference to GLASSES in either his application or any previous reply to any Office Action.

Page 2, line 9: "The requirement is still deemed proper and therefore made FINAL."

This statement is in direct contradiction to the marked box in the previous page entitled Office Action Summary under the section entitled Status. 2b is marked, not 2a. What is the status of a requirement when two seemingly contradictory statements are made by the examiner?

Addressing Section 3. of the Office Action:

It is not my responsibility to describe more than I was able at the time of the drafting of the application. Because of the intricate nature of the invention, many thousands of pages would have been needed to describe every detail of the invention. The uncertainties of Ms. Semunegus on particular points do not invalidate the claims that have been made, to the contrary, the requests for clarification or description by Ms. Semunegus indicate that she has either not read the specification and figures or lacks the rudimentary knowledge to understand the common terminology used in propulsion and fluid dynamics. Steam or hydraulic motors are used to drive the fans, they do not act as fans (See Page 23, Section 120, lines 1-3 of the specification). Mounting points are at or near the junction of the lines bisecting the hexagonal drive-fan cells. This should be obvious to anyone who has read the specification and viewed the figures. The comments made by Ms. Semunegus seem to indicate that it is she who lacks skill in this art or with which it is most nearly connected.